OIPE 4		,			PTO/SB/21 (09-04) Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0034		
Under the Paper Nork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons RANSMITTAL FORM			s are required to respond to a control Application Number Filing Date First Named Inventor Art Unit	09/829,95 April 11, 2	oril 11, 2001 ohn Chad Parry		
(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing) Total Number of Pages in This Submission 4			Examiner Name Attorney Docket Number	Adam L. E	am L. Basehoar		
Fee Trans	smittal Form		OSURES (Check al. Drawing(s)	l that appl	After Allowance Communication to TC		
Fee Attached Amendment/Reply After Final Affidavits/declaration(s) Extension of Time Request Express Abandonment Request		Petition Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address Terminal Disclaimer Request for Refund CD, Number of CD(s) Landscape Table on CD		Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) Proprietary Information Status Letter Other Enclosure(s) (please Identify below): Postcard			
Firm Name			F APPLICANT, ATTO	RNEY, C	DR AGENT		
Signature	JENSEN & PUNTIGAM F	Ja					
Printed name	ROBERT A. JENSEN						
Date	Pate 6/15/05			Reg. No.	24,268		
	С	ERTIFIC	ATE OF TRANSMISS	ION/MA	ILING		
I hereby certify th sufficient postage the date shown b	e as first class mail in an en	peing facsir velope add	mile transmitted to the USPT dressed to: Commissioner fo	O or depos or Patents,	sited with the United States Postal Service with P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on		
Signature		Sta	llen 1. 2				

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

MARCIA WALLENFELS

Typed or printed name

6/15/05

PTO/SB/17 (12-04v2)
Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0032
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Inder the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to re-	soond to a collection of infor	mation unless it displays a valid OMB control number		
ffective on 12/08/2004.	Complete if Known			
Fees persuant to the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005 (H.R. 4818).	Application Number	09/829,951		
FEE TRANSMITTAL	Filing Date	4/11/01		
For FY 2005	First Named Inventor	John C. Parry		
Applicant claims small entity status. See 37 CFR 1.27	Examiner Name	Alan Basehoar		
P Applicant Gains Small entity states. Gee 57 Gr 17 1.27	Art Unit	2178		
TOTAL AMOUNT OF PAYMENT (\$) 225.00	Attorney Docket No.			
METHOD OF PAYMENT (check all that apply)				
Check Credit Card Money Order Non-	e Other (please id	lentify):		
Deposit Account Deposit Account Number: 07-1900		lame: Jensen & Puntigam PS		

METHOD OF PAYMENT (check all that apply)								
Check Credit Card Money Order Other (please identify):								
✓ Deposit Account	✓ Deposit Account Deposit Account Number: 07-1900 Deposit Account Name: Jensen & Puntigam PS							
For the above-ident	ified deposit	account, the D	irector is hereby	authorized t	o: (check all tha	at apply)		
Charge fee(s	Charge fee(s) indicated below Charge fee(s) indicated below, except for the filing fee							
Charge any a	additional fee	(s) or underpa	yments of fee(s)	\equiv	lit any overpayr	•		
warning: Information on thi	R 1.16 and 1	.17		- 0.00			navida anadit aad	
information and authorization			redit card inform	ation should i	not be included	on this form. P	rovide credit card	
FEE CALCULATION		 						
1. BASIC FILING, SEAI	RCH, AND	EXAMINATI	ON FEES					
	FILING	_	SEARCH			TION FEES		
Application Type	Fee (\$)	Small Entity Fee (\$)	<u> Fee (\$)</u>	mall Entity Fee (\$)	Fee (\$)	mall Entity Fee (\$)	Fees Paid (\$)	
Utility	300	150	500	250	200	100		
Design	200	100	100	50	130	65		
Plant	200	100	300	150	160	80		
Reissue	300	150	500	250	600	300		
Provisional	200	100	0	0	0	0		
2. EXCESS CLAIM FEES Small Entity								
Fee Description Fee (\$) Fee (\$)								
Each claim over 20 (including Reissues) 50 25 Each independent claim over 3 (including Reissues) 200 100							100	
1							180	
Total Claims Extra Claims Fee (\$) Fee Paid (\$) Multiple Dependent Claims								
							Fee Paid (\$)	
HP = highest number of total								
Indep. Claims	Extra Clair		(\$) <u>Fee Pa</u>	<u>id (\$)</u>				
3 or HP = x = HP = highest number of independent claims paid for, if greater than 3.								
3. APPLICATION SIZE FEE								
If the specification and drawings exceed 100 sheets of paper (excluding electronically filed sequence or computer								
listings under 37 CFR 1.52(e)), the application size fee due is \$250 (\$125 for small entity) for each additional 50								
sheets or fraction thereof. See 35 U.S.C. 41(a)(1)(G) and 37 CFR 1.16(s). Total Sheets								
4 OTHER FEE(C)								
Non-English Specification, \$130 fee (no small entity discount) Fees Paid (\$)								
Other (e.g., late filing surcharge): Two Month Extension of time to file Response \$225.00								

SUBMITTED BY				
Signature	Ketl	Jan	Registration No. (Attorney/Agent) 24,268	Telephone 206 448-3200
Name (Print/Type)	Robert A. Jenser	1		Date 6/15/05

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.136. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 30 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: John Chad Parry

Serial No : 09/829,951

Filed: April 11, 2001

Title: REMOTE URL MUNGING

Art Unit: 2178

Examiner: Adam L. Basehoar

Date: June 15, 2005

MAIL STOP AMENDMENTS
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE

Dear Sir:

Applicant wishes to thank Examiner Basehoar for his persistent effort in re-mailing the office action in the present application, and in the '952 application, restarting the time and allowing for a response.

With respect to the judicially created double patenting rejection, applicant will consider abandoning or filing a terminal disclaimer on the conflicting claims, upon indication of allowable subject matter.

The examiner has rejected all of the claims in the aboveentitled application based upon the disclosure of Brown. The
examiner has misplaced his reliance on Brown in that all of the
claims in the present application call for an integration of the
customer document and the hosted service information into a single,
seamless document. The Brown invention is referred to specifically
in the current application under the subtitle "Off Site Method",
which is clearly distinguished from the present invention, which is
described in detail under the "Remote URL Munging" subtitle. It is
to be noted that Brown's Figure 8, 60 and Figure 12 A-C are separate
web pages from each other. Figure 8, sub 60 is hosted and maintained
by the customer and sent from the customer to the user, whereas
Figures A-C is hosted and maintained by the ASP and is sent from the

ASP to the user. The documents hosted by the customer and the documents hosted by the ASP are never integrated.

For the examiner's convenience, the Brown model or hosted site search engine or "off site" method can found at http://www.californialung.or/search.html. A person searching for something like "smoking" will notice that after the search button is clicked, they are transported to the Google web site. Notice that the Lung Association's blue side bar is gone; instead the only brand name that they have is a banner at the top of their logo.

Secondly, the onsite method can be found at http://www.findlaw.com/index.html?srchfindlaw, which is also a Google customer, but they are paying Google in order to get a more customizable service. Try and search for a word like "pope"; notice the differences between this example and the previous example. The branding on this search page is exactly the same as on their other pages, and they didn't have to sacrifice anything by hiring out to Google. Findlaw has their own advertising on the page, as Google owned all of the advertising in the previous example. Looking at the URL at http://www.logcrawler.findlaw.com shows that even though Google is helping, a lot of the work was obviously being done by Findlaw itself. It gives control over their branding, but they are paying people a lot to manage the service in-house, which is a distinct disadvantage.

The inventive method is similar to a marriage of the other two techniques. Using techniques created by the inventor, a customer receives all of the advantages and none of the disadvantages of either of the previous techniques. The search service is maintained offsite so the customer doesn't have to spend a lot to run it inhouse, but the results are perfectly in agreement with the customer's own web pages, so it looks like they are hosting. Customers have total control over their own branding, and therefore, the result looks as professional as the second example, but is as inexpensive to administer as the first.

It is urged that the examiner has failed to anticipate a key element of the current invention, and therefore, it is urged that the rejection under 102 or 103, based upon Brown, be withdrawn and a Notice of Allowance is hereby solicited.

The examiner is urged to telephone the applicant's representative should he have any questions or comments.

This is to request a two month extension of time. Enclosed is a check for \$225.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any over payment to Deposit Account 07-1900.

Respectfully submitted, JENSEN & PUNTIGAM, P.S.

Robert A. Jensen #24,268 Attorney for Applicant

RAJ:mw E-mail bj@jensenpuntigam.com 206 448-3200

Enclosures: postcard, check for \$225

1. Total